

participate in cross-community training programs, and promote economic equality when they return to Ireland.

As drafted, H.R. 4293 is intended to help mitigate the social and economic problems that have contributed to civil unrest in Northern Ireland. By permitting young, unskilled people from the areas of civil strife to spend a brief time in the U.S. to learn a craft and experience the diversity of our country, we will help disadvantaged youth in nationalist and loyalist communities break the cycles of unemployment and distrust which have contributed greatly to the civil unrest in the region. The program will also enhance economic relations the trade between the U.S. and Northern Ireland.

When I was in Northern Ireland last year, I was amazed, saddened—and highly insulted—when a leading Unionist party official told me that Catholics remained unemployed in Northern Ireland not because of any subtle or blatant discrimination against them but rather because “they” are unskilled. He proceeded to reason, to my disbelief, that Catholics are good in the arts and entertainment field—i.e., singing and dancing—but are “wanting” in the math, sciences and other applications more fitting for finding work. I asked for data to back up his theory and needless to say I never got it.

It is this sort of “typecasting” and discrimination that can fuel civil strife. I am pleased that H.R. 4293 will go a long way in providing new employment experiences for the workers in both the Catholic and Protestant communities, give them opportunities to disprove the stereotypes they have supposed about each other over the years, and enable them to return home and provide the crucial skill base needed to attract more international private investment opportunities in their local economy.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WILSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4293, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read:

“A bill to establish a cultural training program for disadvantaged individuals to assist the Irish peace process.”

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE WILLIAM D. DELAHUNT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable WILLIAM D. DELAHUNT, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 6, 1998.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House that my office has been served

with a subpoena for documents issued by the Plymouth Superior Court, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, in the case of *Pert Dickie, et al. v. Kelly Regan, et al.*

The subpoena appears to relate to my official duties. I am currently consulting with the Office of General Counsel to determine whether compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and precedents of the House.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM D. DELAHUNT.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. ABERCROMBIE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. RIGGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. RIGGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Ms. FURSE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. FURSE addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. UPTON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BLUMENAUER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GUTKNECHT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PAUL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CONYERS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DUNCAN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SOUDER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. ROUKEMA addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

IN IMPEACHMENT INQUIRY DEBATE, LET MEMBERS PLEDGE ALLEGIANCE TO THEIR COUNTRY, NOT TO THEIR PARTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HULSHOF) is recognized until midnight.

Mr. HULSHOF. Madam Speaker, these past several days this body has been consumed with political wrangling over spending bills and legislative riders, debate over tax cuts and social security, whether to fund the IMF or not fund the IMF. That has been the question.

It seems as if each side has sought some political advantage during these debates. That is not necessarily a criticism. We are, after all, a political body. The question we now face, Madam Speaker, however, is one of profound historical significance: Shall a formal impeachment inquiry commence.

As we consider and struggle with this weighty matter, I implore my colleagues to focus on the gravity of the moment. Some may be tempted to condemn the process, or the prosecutor. But Madam Speaker, now is not the time for talking points or for pointing fingers. Madam Speaker, in this debate, let us not pledge our loyalty to our party, let us pledge, instead, our allegiance to our country. We must not allow ourselves to be partisans. Instead, we must be patriots.

Like many Members, Madam Speaker, I am concerned about the open-ended nature of the resolution. I believe that each of us here would fervently wish this cup could pass us by. But I have profound faith in the integrity and the ability of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Illinois. He has given us his pledge that this process will move forward fairly and expeditiously, and I think the gentleman's word deserves and should be afforded great weight in this body.

The question then before us is whether or not we should follow the considered recommendation of the Committee on the Judiciary to move forward with formal hearings. As we ponder that question, let me ask another, which goes to the very heart of the matter.

□ 0000

Is it possible that credible evidence exists which may constitute grounds for an impeachment? If the answer to the question is a solemn yes, then Members should cast their vote accordingly. But even if they respond with an equivocal "I do not know," I believe the doubt should be resolved in favor of holding hearings and the resolution should be accepted.

Madam Speaker, let us not avert our gaze but instead let us fix our eyes on the horizon wherever that little traveled road leads us. Last January I was granted the privilege to enter this Chamber for the first time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WILSON). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HULSHOF. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for an additional 30 seconds to conclude.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot entertain that request. The gentleman may finish his sentence.

Mr. HULSHOF. Madam Speaker,

Last January, I was granted the privilege to enter this chamber for the first time. My family beamed down at me with pride from the gallery as I began my service to this nation. On that day I rose in unison with my colleagues and pledged my oath, my sacred honor to uphold the Constitution of the United States. In my humble and considered opinion that oath requires from me a vote of "aye" on the resolution.

WHAT IT MEANS TO BE A DEMOCRAT

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include therein extraneous material.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, not wanting to respond directly to my friend, the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY), I must say apparently she has not read the bill. There is nothing in the bill that talks about a land swap. I would invite my friend to read the bill. But then again, that might be asking too much of a Democrat. But that is not in the bill.

I do want to say this, Mr. Speaker, in terms of "What It Means to Be a Democrat", the article that was in the Washington Post by Michael Kelly. He talked to the Committee on the Judiciary the other day about that crimes, even if they had been committed, did not matter. He said what mattered were statements, whether truthful or not, but what was their context.

What the author Michael Kelly talked about is this is where the Democrat party has now come to, that it does not matter if you lie or tell the truth, it just mattered what the contexts are.

Is that what the new Democrat values are? They can talk about a bill that does not even have legislation in it and speak against the bill, but truth does not matter as long as you are a Democrat. The context is what matters. I think it is very important for my colleagues to know what the Democrat party, it seems, has fallen to.

The article referred to is as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 7, 1998]

WHAT IT MEANS TO BE A DEMOCRAT (By Michael Kelly)

Defining moments in politics sometimes arrive with fanfare and glory and purpose: "I pledge you, I pledge myself, to a New Deal for the American people." And sometimes they slip in unplanned and unannounced, and mostly unnoticed—moments where something is defined not by intent but by default.

The defining moment for what it means to be a Democrat now, in the time of Clinton, sidled quietly on-stage this week, on the afternoon of the day when all 16 Democratic members of the House Judiciary Committee, in dereliction of their constitutional duty, voted to block an inquiry into whether a president who is of their party had committed impeachable offenses.

David P. Schippers, the chief investigative counsel for the Republican-controlled Judiciary Committee, had concluded his official report to the committee with a careful finding

that "there exists substantial and credible evidence of 15 separate events directly involving President William Jefferson Clinton that . . . may constitute grounds to proceed with an impeachment inquiry." Schippers then spoke briefly not as a counsel but as "a citizen of the United States who happens to be a father and a grandfather." He paraphrased the line given Sir Thomas More in the play "A Man For All Seasons": "The laws of this country are the great barriers that protect the citizens from the winds of evil and tyranny. If we permit one of those laws to fall, who will be able to stand in the winds that follow?"

This was a Democrat speaking. But Schippers, who ran Attorney General Robert Kennedy's organized crime task force in Chicago, is a Democrat from another time. Every word that Schippers spoke, in his grave and sober and serious report, rested not on the values of any vast right-wing conspiracy, but on what were once the values of a vast (and now almost vanished) Democratic liberalism, a liberalism that knew that it was the office that was sacred, not the man; that it was the law that ruled, not the ruler.

That was then, this is now. When Schippers spoke for the sacred law and for the old values, what was the reaction of the Democrats who sat listening to him in that committee room? They rushed to the chairman to complain that such talk was out of order. And Henry Hyde was happy to concede the point; if the Democrats wished to declare themselves opposed to even oratorical support for the rule of law—why, that would be fine with the Republicans. Hyde ordered Schippers' remarks stricken from the record, and the moment was complete.

So it went. Speaking for the old values, Schippers declared that it must matter if the president had broken the law because he was "the chief law enforcement officer of the United States," a man who had taken an oath to "preserve, protect and defend" the law and whose minions wielded the law against the rest of us citizens. Acts of perjury and obstruction of justice—for any reason, in any case—perpetuated by the man who controlled the forces of the law, Schippers said, would constitute "deliberate and direct assaults . . . upon the justice system of the United States and upon the judicial branch of our government." The chief law enforcement officer of the United States must not be allowed to lie under oath with impunity, he said, for "the principle that every witness in every case must tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth is the foundation of the American system of justice."

Abbe Lowell, the chief investigative counsel for the Democrats on the committee, argued the case for the party's new values. The new values are: Law, schmaw. As Lowell explained, even if the president had lied under oath, even if he had obstructed justice, even if he had committed crimes—it did not matter.

One hears, said Lowell, airily, much talk of "a largely rhetorical question: 'Are you saying that lying under oath or obstruction of justice is not an impeachable offense?'" That question, he sniffed, may be suitable for "classroom debate," but it was not a fit subject for Congress to consider. A proper inquiry, Lowell explained, should not focus on whether Clinton's "statements were or were not truthful, but what were their context, what were their impact, and what were their subject matter."

This is where the party of Franklin Roosevelt wishes to stand? On the ground that it is permissible—under certain circumstances, you see—for a president to lie under oath, to obstruct justice, to break the law? To stand